

Difference feminism and modern citizenship

—A critical review of feminists' debates on sexual difference—

TAKEDA Chinatsu

The 1980s and 1990s have seen a rising public interest in 'cultural pluralism' in Western democracies. This concept assumes that specific needs of particular social groups, ethnic minorities, women, religious groups and homosexuals, for example, have not been adequately addressed within traditional party politics.¹⁾ Within this intellectual framework, how to ensure 'political equality' of different social groups has come to constitute a mainstream political agenda.²⁾ Paying particular attention to internal differences within a given society fits into the post-modern and post-structural logic which attacks universalizing models of modernization theories and emphasizes instead the particular.

Feminists of the 1990s follow this global shift towards micro-level analysis and are aware of what makes women different. This is a major change from earlier feminists of the 1960s and 1970s who emphasized the sameness between men and women: certain difference feminists went so far as to affirm that there is such thing as female innate nature. Other more moderate difference feminists affirmed difference between men and women in order to achieve substantial equality since they observed that formal and legal equality did not eliminate daily inequality in socio-economic terms as well as in the private sphere.

Thus, the debate about how to achieve cultural pluralism came to focus upon a way of increasing substantial equality among individuals by taking into account their cultural and social particularities. In this light, this debate is in line with modern democracies' continuous effort to search for an appropriate definition of citizenship and to ensure a basic human equality among all members of a community.³⁾ From this point of view, how do feminist's difference debates contribute to our better understanding of citizenship? And how do they influence our reflections on modern democracy?

This essay suggests how feminists' debates on sexual difference contribute to modern democracy from the point of view of gender relations.

Firstly, by going over various claims of feminists upon the sexual difference, I will suggest that a dichotomy between sameness to and difference from a male norm of citizenship inherent to the debates on sexual difference was not adequate to achieve substantial equality between the two sexes. Is a moral disposition independent of any gender implication possible, then? From this point of view, secondly, I will deal with difference feminists' criticism on gender-biased moral theories including Okin's critical interpretation of Rawls's 'theory of justice'. I will present Okin's view that a gender-neutral definition of citizenship inspired by Rawls's definition of the original position' is applicable to the family institution itself in order to form citizens free from gender bias.

(1) What is difference feminism?

Certain feminists of the 90s emphasize difference more than sameness between the two sexes. However, difference does not have a monolithic meaning for various difference feminist schools. This section will focus upon three types of difference, namely, sexual difference, differences among women and instability in female self and study how difference feminist schools position themselves with respect to these categories.⁴⁾

Women's difference from men was first recognised among cultural feminists whose positions can be defined in terms of beliefs, characters and contexts reserved for women.⁵⁾ J. Evans divides cultural feminists into strong and weak cultural feminists. For strong cultural feminists, the task of feminists is to perceive the ahistoricity of femaleness and revalue female characteristics like motherhood and nature. Weak cultural feminism differs so far as it assumes that female qualities can be upheld by men and women equally and considers that traditional female virtues such as nurturing and caring attitudes might contribute to improve society as a whole. In contrast, strong cultural feminists refuse any kind of fusion with male culture, insisting upon the absolute superiority of female nature.⁶⁾

Gilligan's 'ethic of care', women's proper morality developed out of care and responsibility within personal relationships constitutes a philosophical backbone of cultural feminism. In addition, some American feminists who have long been liberal now support cultural feminism to some extent. For example, Friedan supports gender-specific laws for pregnant women although she does

not seek to change the pre-existing social and economic system. Another British liberal feminist, Radcliffe suggests that feminists demanded for women the rights and opportunities equal to those of men not as a result of the development of liberalism but because liberalism was not yet sufficiently developed.⁷⁾ From this perspective, equality within a status quo would mean to eliminate arbitrarily disadvantageous treatments of women in all spheres of society. To Radcliff, liberalism and difference feminism are quite compatible in order to achieve substantial equality between the two sexes.

Socialist feminism is concerned with two types of differences; sex and race. Over the last two decades, socialist feminism underwent three major changes: 1) from androgyny to gender difference, 2) from Marxism to reformism within the current system, 3) increased focus on difference between groups instead of class.⁸⁾ In the prevailing neo-liberal intellectual framework, the notion of equality for socialist feminism changed from the abolition of all kinds of oppression to a semi-pluralist notion of political influence.⁹⁾

Iris Young represents such socialist feminists. Although she cautions against the danger of revaluing of womankind, she sees female values as a potential source for good which should be applicable to the public as well as private spheres. However, unlike cultural feminists, Young is also sensitive to the fact that women's cultural differences go hand in hand with social inequalities.¹⁰⁾ She thinks that the politics of group representation is most suitable to rectify political inequalities between the privileged and the underprivileged and proposes institutional mechanisms reserved for minority groups including women and blacks. These mechanisms consist mainly of three factors: First, self-organization of group members, second, voicing a group's analysis of how social policy proposals affect them and generating policy proposals in institutionalized contexts, third, having veto power regarding specific policies that would affect a group directly.¹¹⁾

However, problems remain. Since her notion of groups is that they are fluid, based upon affinity and separation, 'most people have multiple group identifications' as she herself admitted.¹²⁾ Can institutional mechanisms cope with such fluidity? Since we could imagine an unlimited number of minority groups such as women, black women and old black women, retired black women, battered black women....who establishes which groups are 'politically correct'? Furthermore, since a group is by definition 'homogenous', differences

within groups would be eventually eliminated. With regards to women's groups, Anne Phillips points out that women are not a minority group, numerically constituting the half of the population.¹³⁾ Furthermore, it is open to question that women's groups can represent the interests of all women at a time when there are no issues unifying women such as abortion rights and rights to vote as was the case in the 1970s.

The third difference is a post-modern denial of the notion of a fixed self inherent to theories of modernization. Although this main premise of post-modernism emphasizes that a unitary, white and rational man is no more history's subject, making visible difference minority groups, it denies the existence of any unitary subject. While the former is a favorable discovery for feminists, the latter seems almost self-destructive to them since even the concept of women is questioned in the end.

As a post-modern feminist, Judith Butler declares that 'a doer creates a deed and a deed creates a doer.'¹⁴⁾ There is no pre-existing I, but the I who perform. What feminist politics is possible when categories of subjects are reduced to 'performers' who exist only as a result of repeating a set of meanings already socially established? According to her schema, gender becomes a stylized repetition of acts.¹⁵⁾ To subvert the patriarchal order would consist of a failure to repeat, a de-formity of cultural norms inscribed upon the body. Cultural practices of drag, cross-dressing, and the butch/femme identities can be effective to demonstrate the very contingency in the relation between sex and gender.¹⁶⁾ The ultimate overthrowing act would then be 'lesbianism' which subverts compulsory heterosexuality as a political order.

Despite pertinent arguments about gender injustice, post-modern feminism poses problems especially on the political front. When there is no fixed self, how can the interest of each and every one of us be represented politically? From this point of view, Butler's idea to destabilize patriarchy through subversion of one's fixed identity is a strong criticism but is not politically tenable. More generally, post-modernism makes light of our material reality since it is undeniable that a self equipped with his or her body has a certain mental coherence. For example, by denying the category of women, can post-modern feminists forget the reality of what their predecessors had achieved in terms of women's political rights over the last two hundred years?

(2) Difference feminism was trapped in a sameness/difference dilemma.

Despite their common recognition of women's difference from men as a basic posture to advance women's rights, two main themes divide difference feminists of the 90s. The first is on the category of women and the second, on the cause of femaleness.

Can a category of women be generalized? Post-modern feminists and certain black feminists think that there is no such category as 'women' as opposed to other feminists who think that woman is indeed an identical category. Okin, however, comparing the situation of women of the Western culture and those of the Third World rejected the idea that Western feminist political theories served only white middle-class women.¹⁷⁾ By comparing women of the Western culture and those of the Third World in light of feminist political theories and developmental theories, she concluded that gender was a universal category of analysis and Western feminist political theories were also applicable to women across different cultural and social settings.¹⁸⁾ If any woman's any experience is generally and universally useful as was stated by Okin, the question to ask would be then what provoked a fragmentation of female identity among various feminist schools. To answer this question, it is necessary to refer to the nature of post-modernism.

Alain Touraine stated that modernity affirmed that from a historical point of view, the progress of rationality and technique had a double objective: The first was to fight against nature and feudal customs. The second was to create a new culture based upon pleasure, emotions and the intelligence of each individual.¹⁹⁾ This optimistic image of a productive, free and happy modern world broke down when there was a dislocation among economic growth, political freedom and individual liberty during the twentieth-century. If economy does not depend upon Protestant ethics nor the sense of devotion for the country but the instrumental rationality to increase market shares, culture is no more a result of rationalization and consequently cut off from History and universalism inherent to the modernization theories.²⁰⁾ As a result, this dislocation brought about two separate ideological currencies by the end of the twentieth-century; libertarians and communitarians: libertarians adopt instrumental rationality appropriate to participate in the free market economy whereas communitarians claim the recognition of their cultural differences in

the economic context of globalization.

In a sense, the fragmentation of feminists represents a communitarian current. While it is important for particular cultural groups to claim their identity that had been oppressed, their uncompromising attitudes to 'others' manifested for example by strong cultural feminism and black feminism can become another form of racism and intolerance. Furthermore, those who abandon universal principles such as strong cultural feminism and post-modernism are relativists and speak only for themselves. Values are not about what they are but what things should be. From this perspective, communitarianism which rejects 'universalism' misses its object.

The second division is between strong cultural feminists who celebrate innate womanly nature as opposed to others who think female virtues result from socialization. Strong cultural feminists' isolation is politically dangerous since by affirming their innate female nature, their argument could be utilized by conservatives to justify women's traditional subordinate roles in society.

On the legal front, the affirmation of 'sexual difference' turned out to be disastrous for feminists. For example, the 'Sears' case, the sex-discrimination suit brought against the Sears by the Equal Employment opportunity Commission in 1978 constituted a clash between 'sameness' feminists and 'difference' feminists. In contrast, while a sameness feminist historian cited historical examples to prove that women's behaviors are not able to be generalized in terms of job seeking and men and women might have identical interests,²¹⁾ a difference feminist historian testified that 'fundamental differences' between the two sexes, the result of culture or long-standing patterns of socialization, led to women's lack of interest in commission sales jobs.²²⁾ As a result, the difference argument justified job discrimination practices against women in the name of 'natural' difference, fitting in with the logic of Reagan's conservatism. Maternity leave was another issue of controversy between sameness feminists who deny any right to leave and job security and difference feminists who assimilate such guarantees under a gender-neutral category of disability.²³⁾

These two examples point at the inadequacy of sameness/difference paradigm to achieve substantial equality between the two sexes: Discussions on gender-neutral (sameness) and gender-specific (difference) laws in the United States indicate that they lead either to a double-burden of work and

family for women or to an exclusion of women from the job market. This is because the sameness/difference dichotomy refers to the norm of the citizen who is, in fact, a white, middle-class, and male adult.²⁴⁾ On this aspect, Bacchi points out that ‘the debates distract attention from deeper political issues such as the relationship between personal life and work commitments and the way in which Western industrial societies privilege competition and downgrade caring.’²⁵⁾ As a result, how to define a more flexible concept of citizenship has become a feminist task to achieve substantial equality between the two sexes.

(3) Feminists’ criticism against male-biased universal citizenship

What citizenship would then allow for women’s equality with men while at the same time, recognizing their differences? Since there are differences at least in terms of reproduction between the two sexes, only attending to such differences can enable the inclusion of women’s specificity in the discussion on political equality among citizens. From this perspective, difference feminists attacked the traditional morality based upon ‘transcendental reason’. According to the table of opposition by Pythagorus, limit/unlimit implies that to be male (limit) is to be a bearer of form, order or structure and to be female (unlimit) is to be devoid of these.²⁶⁾ This argument suggests that femininity is a negative condition, the intermediate state from which a determinate human identity emerges, implying reproduction of males.²⁷⁾

Moreover, the association of the female principle with the formlessness indicates that female souls do not fully exhibit the logos (reason), necessary to participate in the public life.²⁸⁾ This, in turn, implies that because women’s existence is limited to the private sphere, the female mind should be multiple and unstable without a finite personality.²⁹⁾ These basic premises were taken over by Enlightenment thinkers such as Locke and Rousseau who allocated to women a dependent legal status upon their husbands within a household.

Kant also concluded that women were morally inferior to men because they were focused on the particular and therefore inaccessible to reason.³⁰⁾ He associated women with feeling and wrote: ‘No moral principle is based on any feeling whatsoever. For feeling....always belongs to the order of Nature.’³¹⁾ In contrast, according to Kant, ‘transcendental reason’ (logos) served as a basis for male rationality and sense of justice and justified men’s participation in the

public sphere. The split between society and nature on the one hand and reason and feeling on the other that legitimized women's subordinate social status was particularly influential upon twentieth-century liberal political thinkers such as John Rawls.³²⁾

As a representative thinker of difference feminism, Gilligan launched an ultimate criticism against this exclusively male nature of 'transcendental reason' by proposing a female-centred ethics. Based upon Chodorow's theory, Gilligan suggests that gender socialisation produces two different notions of morality: men's separation from their mothers gives them an ethics of justice based upon rights while women's affiliation to mothers gives them an ethics of care which consists of emphasis (stressing the value of), consequence (calculating the effects on others), and context (assessing social circumstances).³³⁾

Gilligan addressed criticism against Kohlberg's moral development scale based on the traditional dichotomy between male logos and female emotions. In fact, studies using his scale revealed sexual differences (male superiority) in the level of moral reasoning in line with the Western philosophical tradition.³⁴⁾ Gilligan suggests that these results were unfounded since the research paradigm implicitly adopted male life as the norm and tried to fashion women out of masculine cloth. Instead of patriarchal values, she affirmed instead that care and responsibility within personal relationships constituted a distinct morality of femininity and genuinely distinct from impartiality often associated with masculinity.³⁵⁾

Similarly, Young affirmed that there were observed differences between masculine and feminine body comportment due to a particular social formation during a particular epoch. For example, she pointed out that the way a girl and a boy throw differs.³⁶⁾ Assuming that feminine ways of moving body defines women's subjectivity, Young concluded that Beauvoir's account of woman's existence defined by a basic tension between immanence (society defines her the other) and transcendence (women is also a free subject) was also reflected in her relation to space.³⁷⁾ In particular, since a woman tends to live her body as a thing, she remains rooted in immanence, is inhibited, and retains a distance from her body as transcending movement and from commitment to the worldly possibilities.³⁸⁾ Such 'femininity' however is largely determined by the patriarchal nature inherent to Western society which confines women to be

physically inhibited, confined and objectified.³⁹⁾ A lack of physical practices, fear of visibility and threat of bodily invasion therefore confines her space, inhibiting her existence as a free subject.⁴⁰⁾

As a result of these reflections, Young thinks that women's differences from men should be emphasised and respected as such. However, the traditional notion of universal citizenship mirroring the interests of dominant groups does not accommodate these particular differences inherent to women since the ideal of the public realm of citizenship as expressing a general will which transcends differences of citizens operates as a demand for homogeneity among citizens.⁴¹⁾ Therefore, it suppresses particular interests of minority groups such as the specificity of women's bodies and desire and the difference of race and culture...⁴²⁾ Her proposal was then to reach 'dialogic reason' which transcends this dichotomy between impartial and particular. As long as the dialogue allows all perspectives to speak freely, and be heard through the institutional mechanism I mentioned earlier, the expression of need, motive and feelings will not have merely private significance and will not bias nor distort the conclusions because they will interact with other need, motives and feelings.⁴³⁾

I suggest that Young's idea seems problematic on a number of fronts. Firstly, is liberal politics a mere instrument to increase particular interests of some groups? Such an interpretation of liberalism based upon the theory of 'rational choice' seems rather rooted in American political culture. Other visions of liberalism are perceptible in the British and European liberal traditions. A representative reactionary thinker of the French Revolution, Burke was strongly opposed to a dichotomy between feeling and reason, the idea that was also adopted by early French liberals such as Mme de Staël, B. Constant and A. de Tocqueville. Another nineteenth-century British liberal, J.S. Mill stressed that liberalism enriched individual differences that were not selfish. He wrote; 'to be held to rigid rules of justice for the sake of others develops the feelings and capacities which have the good of others for their object. The better development of the social part of his nature is rendered possible by the restraint put upon the selfish part.'⁴⁴⁾

Secondly, her 'dialogic reason' does not seem different from the notion of impartiality. While admitting that Kant's notion of impartiality is rather rigid, Mills' description of the 'public mind' mentioned above does not oppose reason

to feeling. Is there a dichotomy between reason and feeling, male and female moral disposition or universalism and particularism?

(4) Towards a gender-neutral concept of citizenship and democracy

In line with some nineteenth-century liberals, Okin refuses to split reason and feeling and proposes an alternative view of morality by revising as well as relying on Rawls's 'theory of justice'. It is well-known that Rawls developed a political theory based upon individual freedom as well as on substantial equality among individuals. His originality to ensure this double combination derives from two elements that characterized his political and moral theory ; the first is his notion of the 'original position': the parties are rational and mutually disinterested and while no limits are placed on the general information available to them, they deliberate behind a veil of ignorance that conceals from them all knowledge of their individual characteristics. Nobody knows his place in society and individuals are given primary goods, basic liberties and goods that are prerequisites for the pursuit of distinct ends and interests that they are unaware of. The second is the principle of difference, the principle that directs our attention to the worst that can happen under any proposed course of action and to decide in light of this.⁴⁵⁾

As Rawls wrote, 'the combination of mutual disinterest and the veil of ignorance achieve the same purpose as benevolence.'⁴⁶⁾ This combination of conditions forces each person in the original position to take the good of others into account. It implies that to practice this moral disposition, individuals are required of both strong empathy and a preparedness to listen carefully to very different points of views of others. Consequently, Okin underlines that the original position supposes not a Kantian type of abstract morality but is open to an appreciation and concern for concrete social and other human differences and that we must think from the position of everybody, in the sense of each in turn.⁴⁷⁾ In other words, individuals should turn to both feeling and reason in order to dispose of an altruistic moral disposition at the original position. If we include in the list of things unknown by a person at the original position the category of 'sex', men and women at the original position are forced to question gender customs from all points of view, including that of women.

Consequently, Okin suggests that such a morality refutes the gender-

biased dichotomy between care and justice on the one hand and between particularism and universalism on the other but still serves as a moral basis for a flexible moral base for citizenship. This flexible moral disposition should be encouraged in society at large to ensure such a gender-neutral society. But how do we promote such morality? Okin thinks this question should be relocated within Rawls's theory of justice, theory concerned with the question of how, whether and to what extent beginnings should affect outcomes.

Society divides us into two distinct groups, men and women from an early stage of life and this gender distinction as an organizing principle of society affects the course of our whole life. Young and Gilligan propose that women should affirm their 'differences' from men in order to achieve equality between the two sexes. But does this really help rectify gender injustice? Since sexual differences result from socialization and mothering in particular, their proposition runs the risk of preserving actual sexual inadequacies without questioning gender injustice rooted in the family structure. Therefore, a substantial justice between the sexes should question the family institution as the very source of perpetuating gender injustice. In other words, in order for individuals to develop their potential to become free persons, social justice requires that gender not be the cause that might affect our life. How would it be possible?

Rawls thinks that the family is the first school of moral development in line with Rousseau, Hegel and Tocqueville. Since he values 'self-esteem' as the most important of the primary goods at the original position, it implies that he attributes a fundamental importance of loving parenting for the development of a sense of justice and recognized the political importance of family for nurturing the sense of citizenship. However, he does not mention internal justice within the family which, as we have seen, constitutes the 'private' root of gender injustice in society at large. In other words, since Rawls assumes that individuals are male heads of the household, other members' well-being depends upon men's discretion, which makes Rawls's theory of justice less justifiable from the point of view of our contemporary vision of individual rights.

This is why 'justice' should be applicable to the family institution itself since there are situations where justice is a crucial virtue in the family composed of individuals whose interests conflict with one another (domestic

violence, marital rapes are good examples). Furthermore, how could children develop a sense of justice in the face of gender inequalities between the two parents? A real gender-neutral society would be possible only if we established a gender-neutral family that might be possible only if sex is unknown at the original position and difference principles are applied inside the family institution.

Rawl's main principle, justified inequalities both to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged and attached to offices and positions open to all ensures that there is no linkage between one's sex and current gender division of labor within the family. As a result, men as well as women who put themselves in the shoes of women at the original position go further than the formal legal equality of the sexes bringing about substantial justice in line with the principle of benefiting the least advantaged. Only then does the sex become a morally irrelevant item in society.

Conclusion

This essay has examined what difference feminism entails in terms of moral and political implication. I have suggested that although a naïve appraisal of female virtue might be detrimental to feminists' cause in so far as it runs the risk of being complicit with patriarchal social values, difference feminism nonetheless constitutes a powerful challenge to traditional moral and political theories. I have also demonstrated that difference feminists such as Gilligan and Young pointed out that sexual differences resulted from socialization and that the traditional political morality based upon abstract reason could not cope with these differences. In contrast, Okin proposes a new morality irrespective of gender based upon empathy and benevolence as a moral basis of citizenship. The idea derives from Rawl's sense of justice: those in the original position must think from the perspective of everybody which requires strong empathy to others (the particular) and transcendental reasoning (the universal).

If we conclude sex in the characteristics (the veil of ignorance) that individuals are supposed not to know in the original position and apply Rawl's principle of difference to family institutions, then, families as a source of perpetuating sexual division of labor would be replaced by families that would

take into account the potential of each individual irrespective of gender. Finally, such a democratic family would serve as a basic unit to form a truly democratic society.

- 1) Phillips, A., *Democracy/Difference*, Oxford, 1993, p.127.
- 2) Ibid., p.127.
- 3) Marshall, T.H., *Sociology at the crossroads*, London, 1963, pp.72-73.
- 4) Phillips, A., (eds.), *Destabilizing theory; contemporary feminist debates*, Cambridge, 1992, p.5.
- 5) Evans, J., *Feminist theory today; contemporary feminist debates*, Cambridge, 1992, p.5.
- 6) Phillips, A.,(eds.), *Destabilizing*, p.79.
- 7) Radcliffe, R., *The skeptical feminist*, London, 1980, p.388.
- 8) Evans, J., *Feminist*, pp.112-113.
- 9) Young, I., 'Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal of universal citizenship' from *Ethics*, January 1988, pp.250-274 and p.262.
- 10) Ibid., p.260.
- 11) Phillips, A., *Democracy*, p.135.
- 12) Evans, J., *Feminist*, p.127.
- 13) Phillippes, A., *Democracy*, p.135.
- 14) Butler, J., *Gender trouble*, London, 1990.
- 15) Ibid., p.140.
- 16) Ibid., p.132.
- 17) Young, I., 'The ideal of community and the politics of difference', in L.Nicholson (eds.), *Feminism/Postmodernism*, New York, 1990, p.302.
- 18) Okin, S., 'Gender inequality and cultural differences', from *Political theory*, 1994, pp.5-24.
- 19) Ibid., p.21.
- 20) Touraine, A., *La critique de la modernit* , Paris, 1992, p.239.
- 21) Ibid., p.240.
- 22) Scott, J., 'Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism' from *Conflicts in feminism*, Hirsch, M. and Keller, E., (eds.), New York and London, p.130.
- 23) Ibid., p.130.
- 24) Young, I., 'Polity', p.273.
- 25) Phillips, A., *democracy*, p.37.
- 26) Bacchi, C., *Same difference*, New York, 1990, pp.263-264.
- 27) Lovibond, S., 'An ancient theory of gender: Plato and the Pythagorean table' from *Women in ancient societies*, Archer, L., Fischler, S., and Wyke, M. (eds.), London, 1994.
- 28) Ibid., p.92.
- 29) Ibid., p.92.

- 30) For example, Kant believed that moral duties were identified by rational free persons through the purely abstract process of reason. He also argued that the moral law must be above personal considerations, that is, independent of the feelings of those involved in particular applications. Shogan, D., *A reader in feminist ethics*, Toronto, 1992, p.103.
- 31) Kant, I., *The doctrine of Virtue, pt.2: metaphysic of morals*, trans.May J.Gregor, New York, 1964, p.33.
- 32) Okin, S., 'Reason and feeling on thinking about justice' in *Ethics* no. 99 (January 1989), pp.229-249.
- 33) Gilligan, *An ethic of care*, pp.112.
- 34) Kaplan, G., (eds.), *Contemporary Western European feminism*, London, 1992, p.219.
- 35) Greeno, C., and Maccoby, E., 'How different is the different voice?', from *an ethic of care*, Larrabee, M., (eds.), New York, 1987, p.193.
- 36) Ibid., p.192.
- 37) Young, I., *Throwing like a girl: a phenomenology of feminine body comportment, mobility, and spatiality: and other essays in feminist philosophy and social theory*, Indianapolis, 1990.
- 38) Blum, L., 'Gilligan and Kohlberg: implications for moral theory', from *an ethic of care*, p.50.
- 39) Young, I., 'Throwing', pp.142.
- 40) Ibid., p.143.
- 41) Ibid., p.150.
- 42) Ibid., p.153.
- 43) Ibid., p.154.
- 44) Mill, J.S., *On liberty and other writings*, Cambridge, 1989, p.63.
- 45) Rawls, J., *Theory of justice*, Chicago, 1970. Talisse, R.B., *John Rawls et la théorie de la justice*, Paris, 1995.
- 46) Rawl, Theory, pp.148-149.
- 47) Okin, 'Reason and feeling', p.245.

Bibliography

- Bacci, C., *Same difference*, New York, 1990.
- Bellamy, R., *Liberalism and modern society*, Cambridge, 1992.
- Blum, L., 'Gilligan and Kohlberg: implications for moral theory' from *An ethic of care*, Larrabee, M.J.(eds.), New York, 1986.
- Bock, G. and James, S., *Beyond equality and difference*, London, 1992.
- Bryson, V., *Feminist political theory*, London, 1992.
- Butler, J., *Gender trouble*, London, 1990.
- Evans, J., *Feminist theory today*, London, 1995.
- Flanagan, O.and Jackson, K., 'Justice, care, and gender: the Kohlberg-Gilligan debate revisited', *An ethic of care*, Larrabee, M.J.(eds.), New York, 1986.
- Friedan, B., *The second stage*, New York, 1981.
- Garry, A. and Pearsall, M. (eds.), *Women, knowledge and reality*, London, 1989.

- Gatens, M., *Feminism and philosophy*, New York, 1991.
- Gilligan, C., *In a different voice*, Cambridge Mass., 1982.
- Gray, J., *Liberalism*, Stratford, 1986.
- Greeno, C. and Maccoby, E., 'How difficult is the different voice?', From *an ethic of care*, Larrabee, M.J. (eds.), New York, 1986.
- Grosz, E., 'Conclusions: a note on essentialism and difference', from *Feminism and philosophy*, Gates, M.(eds.), New York, 1991.
- Jagger, A., 'Abortion and a woman's right to decide' from *Feminism and philosophy*, Gates, M., New York, 1991.
- James, S., 'The good-enough citizen: citizenship and independence' from *Beyond equality and difference*, Bock, G. and James, S., (eds.), 1992, London.
- Katz, M., 'Ideology and the status of women in ancient Greece' from *Women in antiquity: new assessments*, Hawley, R. and Levick, B.M.(eds.), London, 1995.
- Kaplan, G., (eds.), *Contemporary Western European feminism*, London, 1992.
- Larabee, J., 'Gender and moral development: a challenge for feminist theory', *An ethic of care*, Larabee, M.J.(eds.), New York, 1986.
- Lands, J., *Women and the public sphere in the age of the French Revolution*, Cornell, 1988.
- Lovenduski, J. and Randall, V., *Contemporary feminist politics*, Oxford, 1993.
- Lovibond, S., 'An ancient theory of gender: Plato and the Pythagorean table' from *women in ancient societies: an illusion of the night*, Fischler, S. and Wyke, M. (eds.), London, 1994.
- Marshall, T.H., *Sociology at the crossroads*, London, 1963.
- Mills, J.S., *On liberty and other writings*, Cambridge, 1989.
- Nell, O., 'How do we know when opportunities are equal?', from *Feminism and philosophy*, Gates, M., New York, 1991.
- Okin, S., 'Gender inequality and cultural differences' from *Political theory*, 1994, pp.5-24.
- Okin, S., 'Gender, the public and the private' from *political theory today*, Held, D.(eds.), Cambridge, 1992.
- Okin, S., *Justice, gender and the family*, New York, 1989.
- Okin, S., 'Reason and feeling in thinking about justice', from *Ethics* no.99, January, 1989, pp.229-249.
- Pateman, C., 'Equality, difference, subordination : the politics of motherhood and women's citizenship' from *Beyond equality and difference*, Bock, G. and James, S.(eds.), London, 1992.
- Pateman, C., 'Feminist critiques of the public/private dichotomy' from *Feminism and equality*, Philipps, A.(eds.), Oxford, 1987.
- Pateman, C., *The sexual contract*, Cambridge, 1988.
- Phillips, A., *Democracy/Difference*, Oxford, 1993.
- Phillips, A., *Destabilizing theory: contemporary feminist debates*, Cambridge, 1992.
- Phillips, A., *Engendering democracy*, Cambridge, 1991.
- Phillips, A., (eds.), *Feminism and equality*, Oxford, 1987.
- Radcliffe, R., *The skeptical feminist*, London, 1980.
- Rawls, J., *Theory of justice*, Chicago, 1970.

- Rowbotham, S., *Women in movement*, New York, 1988.
- Sassoon, S., *Women and the state*, London, 1987.
- Saxonhouse, A., *Women in the history of political thought*, New York, 1985.
- Shogan, D., *A reader in feminist ethics*, Toronto, 1992.
- Scott, J., 'Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: or, the uses of post-structuralist theory for feminism' from *Conflicts in feminism*, Hirsch, M. and Keller, E.(eds.), New York and London, 1990, pp.128-145.
- Talisso, R.B., *John Rawls et la théorie de la justice*, Paris, 1995.
- Tong, R., *Feminist thought*, London, 1995.
- Touraine, A., *Critique de la modernité*, Paris, 1992.
- Touraine, A., *Qu'est-ce que la démocratie ?*, Paris, 1994.
- Young, I., 'The ideal of community and the politics of difference' from *Feminism/Postmodernism*, Nicholson, L.(eds.), New York, 1990.
- Young, I., 'Impartiality and the civic public' from *Feminism as critique*, Benhabib, S. and Cornell, D.(eds.), Minnesota, 1986.
- Young, I., *Justice and the politics of difference*, Princeton and Oxford, 1990.
- Young, I., 'Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal of universal citizenship' from *Ethics*, January 1989, pp.250-274.
- Young, I., *Throwing like a girl: a phenomenology of feminine body comportment, mobility, and spatiality: and other essays in feminist philosophy and social theory*, Indianapolis, 1990.